

Remarks

Claims 1-12, 14-21 and 23-25 are pending in the current application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 4 and 18-21 have been canceled.

Claims 1-12, 14-21 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Trompower et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,591.

The Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation for Applicants' claims. "[F]or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach *every aspect* of the claimed invention ..." MPEP 706.02 (emphasis added). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v., Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Trompower et al. simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any claim, as the following analysis shows.

CLAIM 14

Regarding Claim 14, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach "polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device" as claimed in Claim 14.

The Office Action asserts that the limitations of Claim 14 are taught in Column 10, Lines 40-67 of Trompower et al. Here, Trompower et al. teaches a roamed to indicator 310 containing a flag bit set to indicate that a mobile terminal has roamed

thereto in the last 24 hours from the base station in which the roaming table is maintained. However, “has roamed to in the last 24 hours” is not the same as “is receiving a signal from the slave device.” In Trompower et al., when the flag is set, a mobile terminal may have roamed to the base station, for example, 10 hours ago, but the base station is not currently receiving a signal from the mobile device. Further, Trompower et al. teaches “the roamed to indicator 310 is a useful indication of which base stations 154, 156 the mobile terminals 166 previously registered to the preset base station had a tendency to move on to.” The roamed to indicator 310 of Trompower et al. is not an indication of “is receiving a signal from the slave device” as claimed in Claim 14.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 14. The rejection of Claim 14 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 15-17 depend from allowable Claim 14 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include “wherein polling the first master transmitting device includes determining whether the first master transmitting device is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device.” As illustrated with respect to Claim 14, Trompower et al. does not disclose polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be

withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 5-12 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 23

Regarding Claim 23, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave” as claimed in amended Claim 23.

As illustrated with respect to Claim 14, Trompower et al. does not disclose polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 23. The rejection of Claim 23 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 24-25 depend from allowable Claim 23 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: May 19, 2004

Rita M. Wisor

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number:

(512) 314-0340

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

5.19.04

Date of Deposit

David S. Watson

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

dlw
Signature

5.19.04

Date